

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,049	01/15/2002	Monika Oswald	218230US0X	2944
22850	7590 01/28/2005		EXAMINER	
•	PIVAK, MCCLELLA	STEIN, STEPHEN J		
1940 DUKE ALEXANDR	STREET IA, VA 22314		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
	•		1775	

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

. ,		Uh	/
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/045,049	OSWALD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen J Stein	1775	
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 11 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average in all propertion under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated and only of the control of the	ation. A proper reply h places the applica	/ to a tion in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Official filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.136(a).	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply se later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriate originally set in the final (opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	•		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claim	s.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		idered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: 21-30.			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>14 and 15</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>9-13,16 and 17</u> .		•	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 18-20 and	<u>31-33</u> .		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. Other:			
		Stephen J Stein Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1775	tti-

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 2. NOTE: The newly added limitation "sintering" in claim 9 requires a further search and consideration of the prior art.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments have not overcome the rejections over the prior art of record .